Editor and Reviewer #1 point #1: Please note that manuscripts with inadequate language quality will not be accepted in the journal. If editors and / or reviewers indicate that language revisions are required for your manuscript, we strongly encourage using a professional language editing service. Elsevier's Language Editing services provides professional and prompt editing of scientific language for research submissions (<https://webshop.elsevier.com/language-editing-services/language-editing/>). All manuscripts edited with Elsevier's Language Editing services are accompanied by a certificate that may be submitted to the journal as proof for language editing. Poor language may lead to rejection of your manuscript even at the revision stage.

Author response #1: The latest revised version of manuscript is now corrected using the Antidote software.

Editor and Reviewer #1 point #2: The study does not provide an adequate sample size to support its conclusions. The limited number of samples undermines the reliability and generalizability of the findings. Used 70/30 split in the experiment. Given the small sample size, 26 samples, reporting k-fold (say k=10) cross-validation is essential to demonstrate the generalizability of the approach.

Author response #2: While we certainly agree with the suggestion regarding the usage of K-fold cross validation, we feel like this approach would not have significantly improved the validity of this research. When dealing with small data samples, using K-fold cross-validation to analyze results can be more complex than a single train-test split. This would lead to interpreting performance variations across the different folds becomes more challenging.

[  
Editor and Reviewer #1 point #3: The methodology section lacks sufficient detail and clarity. Key aspects of the experimental design, data collection, and analysis procedures are not well explained, making it difficult to assess the validity and reproducibility of the results.

Author response #3: The methodology section of the revised manuscript is now made more clear. Research design flowchart has also been added for the clarity of research steps that were carried throughout the study period. The methodology section has now been made more simpler, scientific and clear as per the suggestion from editor and reviewer side.